

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program*

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$976,773
------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	American River Basin IRWM Stormwater Flood Management Grant Proposal – Upper Unionhouse Creek Flood Projection Project	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$1,953,546
-----------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------

---

### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The project would widen the channel of Unionhouse Creek in south Sacramento County, with modifications to the concrete channel bottom. The project will solve flooding issues in the project reach at a lower cost than what could be achieved with the Federal Project, and by removing this reach from the Federal Project will leverage other federal, state and local funds for underfunded flood protection improvements elsewhere in the Morrison Creek watershed.

### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			45

### EVALUATION SUMMARY

#### Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Work Plan contains an introduction that includes the goals and objectives of the proposal and its relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan. In addition, the introduction contains a tabulated overview of the proposed project, which includes an abstract and project status. Also, included is a regional map showing the relative project location and a brief discussion of the project's synergies and linkages among the American River Basin projects. Each proposed task is of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented. The proposed project includes quarterly, annual, and final reports among others as work item submittals. In addition, the Work Plan includes a list of permits and their status including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance when applicable. Overall, the

tasks collectively implement the Proposal and consist of a standalone project. The proposed Work Plan appears to be consistent with the area's Basin Plan.

### **Budget**

The Budget has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories lack detail. Specifically, the costs associated with Project Performance Monitoring, Mitigation Measures (Table 6), and Construction Administration lack sufficient detail. The Budget was developed by identifying a cost per unit than identifying the associated number of units that would be required to accomplish each task. The estimate of hours shown for the CEQA and Permitting tasks and FEMA LOMA process in Table 4 should have been explained in more detail. The cost shown in Table 6 (pg 6) and the construction administration costs (pg 7) were also concerning as not enough detail is provided to tell if they are reasonable.

### **Schedule**

The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of the project no later than six months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The applicant has presented an adequately detailed and specific Schedule for the project that adequately documents the Proposal.

### **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Project goals and objectives are listed in the Work Plan as extending 100 year flood protection, contributing to a solution to flood concerns that are preventing the Sacramento Regional Transit District from connecting Downtown Sacramento with Cosumnes River College, and reducing the scope and cost of the federal flood control project. Reducing sedimentation in the stream is also discussed as a benefit of this project. However, only goals associated with reducing flooding are addressed in the monitoring, assessment, and performance measures table. Furthermore, one of the outcome indicators does not adequately monitor or assess the performance of the project, as measuring the length of stream that was improved will not indicate a successful reduction in flooding.

### **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

Average levels of FDR and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. The data sources and valuation approach used to generate the FDR benefits are well documented. A minor adjustment to bring the present value (PV) of benefits to a 2009 value was made, but, it did not change the level of claimed benefit.

### **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits:**

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are described, but no physical or economic quantification is provided to substantiate the magnitude of potential benefits. The linkage of transit improvements to the proposed project is unclear.

### **Program Preferences**

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management with Land use Planning, Practice Integrated

Flood Management, and Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.